

Annual Review Of Base Rates for Fuel Costs Of Duke Power Company

Docket No. 98-003-E



HEARING DATE May 14, 1998



Testimony of Jacqueline R. Cherry Accounting Department

South Carolina Public Service Commission

2		TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE R. CHERRY	
3		FOR	
4		THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA	
5		DOCKET NO. 98-003-E	
6		IN RE: DUKE POWER COMPANY	
7			
8			
9	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE FOR THE RECORD, YOUR NAME,	
LO		ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION?	
L1	A.	My name is Jacqueline R. Cherry. My business address is 111 Doctors	
12		Circle, Columbia, South Carolina. I am employed by the Public Service	
L3		Commission of South Carolina, Accounting Department, as a fiscal	
L4		analyst/utilities accountant.	
L5	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL	
L6		BACKGROUND AND YOUR BUSINESS EXPERIENCE?	
L7	A.	I received a B.S. Degree in Business Administration with a major in	
18		Accounting from Johnson C. Smith University in 1976. I was employed	
L9		by this Commission in February 1979, and have participated in cases	
20		involving gas, electric, telephone, water and wastewater utilities.	

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS

	2	P	R	0	C	EE	D	IN	1C	?;	
--	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	----	----	----	--

1

- 3 A. The purpose of my testimony is to summarize the results of the
- 4 Accounting Staff's examination of Duke Power Company's Fuel
- 5 Adjustment Clause operation for the period June 1997 through May
- 1998. The findings of the examination are contained in the Accounting
- Department's section of the Commission Staff Report, prepared for this
- 8 proceeding.
- 9 Q. WHAT WAS THE SCOPE OF THE EXAMINATION?
- 10 A. The Accounting Staff traced the fuel information, as filed in the
- 11 Company's required monthly filing, to the Company's books and
- records. The examination covered the period **April 1997** through
- March 1998. The purpose of the examination was to determine if Duke
- Power Company had computed and applied the monthly Fuel
- Adjustment Clause in accordance with the approved clause. To
- accomplish this, Staff examined the components surrounding the
- operation of the clause.
- 18 Q. WHAT WERE THE STEPS THAT THE STAFF EMPLOYED WITHIN
- 19 THE SCOPE OF THE EXAMINATION?
- 20 A. The examination consisted of the following:

	Testi	imony of Jacqueline R. Cherry <u>Docket No. 98-003-Е</u>	Page
1		1. An Analysis of Account # 151 Fuel Stock	
2		2. Sample of Receipts to the Fuel Stock Account Account #151	
3		3. Verification of Charges to Nuclear Fuel Expense Account # 518	
4		4. An Analysis of Purchased Power and Interchange	
5		5. Verification of KWH Sales	
6		6. A Comparison of Coal Costs	
7		7. An Analysis of Spot Coal Purchasing Procedures	
8		8. Recomputation of Fuel Cost Adjustment Factor and Verification of	
9		Deferred Fuel Costs	
10		9. Recomputation of True-up for (Over) Under-Recovered Fuel Costs	
11	Q.	WITH REGARD TO THE TRUE-UP OF (OVER) UNDER-RECOVERED	
12		FUEL COSTS, WOULD YOU PLEASE ELABORATE ON STAFF'S	
13		COMPUTATION?	
14	A.	Staff analyzed the cumulative under-recovery of fuel costs that the	
15		Company had incurred for the period April 1997 through March 1998 of	
16		\$1,956,794. Staff added the projected over-recovery for April 1998 of	
17		\$3,072,130 and the projected over-recovery for May 1998 of \$713,757	
18		to arrive at a cumulative over-recovery of \$1,829,093. The Company's	

cumulative under-recovery as of March 1998 and the Company's

cumulative over-recovery as of May 1998 differs from Staff's. Staff's

19

20

Purchased Power figures for June 1997 through September 1997 differs
from the Company's figures. Staff's figures, per Staff's report, reflect
calculation adjustments made to Purchased Power Costs for the
aforementioned months, based on Staff's review of Purchased Power
invoices and system operations reports. On a S.C. jurisdictional basis,
the difference between the Company's and the Staff's cumulative
under-recovery balances as of actual March 1998 is \$117,206, and the
difference between the Company's and the Staff's cumulative over-
recovery balances as of estimated May 1998 is \$117,093 (on a rounded
basis, the cumulative difference is \$117,000). Staff's Exhibit G, S.C.
Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues and Expenses, which consists of
two pages, provides details of Staff's cumulative over-recovery balance.
As stated in Duke Power Company's Adjustment for Fuel Costs, fuel
costs will be included in base rates to the extent determined reasonable
by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission should consider the
over-recovery of \$1,829,093 along with the anticipated fuel costs for the
period June 1, 1998 to May 31, 1999 for the purpose of determining the
base costs for fuel in base rates effective June 1, 1998. This
over-recovery figure of \$1,829,093 was furnished to the Commission's
Utilities Department.

Q. MRS. CHERRY, WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THE

2 REMAINING STAFF EXH	{ BITS?
-----------------------	---------

- 3 A. Staff prepared exhibits from Duke Power Company's books and records
- reflecting fuel costs during the review period.
- 5 Specifically, these exhibits are as follows:
- 6 Exhibit A Coal Cost Statistics
- 7 Exhibit B Received Coal-Cost Per Ton Comparison
- 8 Exhibit C Detail of Nuclear Cost
- 9 Exhibit D Total Burned Cost (Fossil and Nuclear)
- 10 Exhibit E Cost of Fuel
- Exhibit F Factor Computation
- Exhibit G S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues and Expenses
- Q. MRS. CHERRY, WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE ACCOUNTING
- 14 DEPARTMENT'S EXAMINATION?
- A. Based on the Accounting Staff's examination of Duke Power Company's
- books and records, and the utilization of the fuel cost-recovery
- mechanism as directed by the Commission, the Accounting Department
- is of the opinion that the Company has complied with the directives (per
- the Fuel Adjustment Clause) of the Commission.
- Q. MRS. CHERRY, DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

2

South Carolina Public Service Commission 111 Doctors Circle, Columbia, SC 29203 Post Office Box 11649, Columbia, SC 29211